

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the discussion below.

Applicants invention has been extensively discussed in previously filed Responses which are incorporated herein by reference with the following comments being addressed to the outstanding new rejections.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to whether the reflective layer of the glass body is the same as the reflective layer which equips the support. In response to this rejection Applicants have cancelled claim 3 and rewritten new independent claim 36 which incorporates essentially the same limitations in a format to address the Examiner's objections with respect to claim 3.

Claims 14 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. In response to this rejection Applicants have cancelled claim 14 and provided new independent claim 37 in a format which meets the Examiner's requirement.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 15-17, 20-22, 25, 28-30, 32 and 34-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by newly cited reference to Laor U.S. Patent No. 6,275,626. According to the rejection, Laor teaches a switch in Figure 5 which has two mirrors surfaces 112 and 114 and a support 28 equipped with a

reflective layer and that the mirror surfaces 112 and 114 are arranged on a switch body 26.


In response to these rejections Applicants have provided new independent claims 36-41 in such a manner to specify that the glass body has directly opposing surfaces with a corresponding reflective surface which is in contrast to the support 28 of Laor in Figure 5 and particularly the positioning of the mirror surfaces 112 and 114 which are not arranged on opposing main surfaces of support 28. Once again Applicants submit that each of independent claims recites that there are two main surfaces on opposing sides and that they contain the reflective layers.

Because each of the independent claims 36 to 41 in this application contain these limitations, Applicants submit that this application defines subject matter not available from the reference to Laor. Likewise the rejection of claims 4, 12, 18-19, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by or the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103 is obvious over Laor is traversed because there is no indication but the distinguishing features between the claimed invention and the references would be obvious variations to one of ordinary skill in the art having before them the reference to Laor. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this application containing independent claims 36 to 41 be allowed and be passed to issue.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #080313.48982US).

Respectfully submitted,



Vincent J. Sunderdick
Registration No. 29,004

August 5, 2004

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

VJS:adb:ejb
#328156